

or whether they were being honest in their representations, the fact of the matter is that a Member's view of a bill does in fact change in light of the action on a previous amendment or a motion to recommit or some other action that might occur.

So, as I said to the gentleman last week, the situation substantively changes. It may be the same bill, but it is a bill that has been subjected to an alternative amendment.

Then the Member who is opposed to the bill at that time without that amendment being considered, that amendment fails, the Member is put in a different position. He or she then has to make a judgment, do I support or oppose this bill as it now is and as I have failed to perfect it with an amendment.

So I suggest to the gentleman, who has now raised it a second time in a row, and I frankly thought it had been resolved, that he is wrong in his premise, he is wrong under the rules, and I would hope that we could put this behind us.

I would certainly hope, and the gentleman who chairs the Rules Committee is on his feet, that we could allow these amendments; that we could allow, as the gentleman so often when he was in the minority asked to have done, allow these amendments to be considered in a fair and open debate and subject them to a vote. So that in a democratic body, in the People's House, they could be voted on up or down.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman was fully within the rules and fully within his rights and did exactly the only thing that he was given the opportunity to do in order to raise an important issue in this democratic forum.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is sort of interesting that, as I have stood here earlier this week during debate, I have had my intentions questioned by Members on the other side of the aisle throughout this week. Throughout hours of debate yesterday, people were questioning my intentions as we were looking at the issue of lobbying and ethics reform.

Having said that, I think it is very important to note that when we were in the minority, about which my friend is speaking, we were often denied even an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit on legislation. Time and time again that happened. When we won the majority in 1994, we provided a guarantee that members of the minority would be able to offer a motion to recommit.

We knew full well this opportunity would come forward, and Mr. LAHOOD was simply asking of the Chair whether or not under the precedents it is appropriate for a Member to stand up, state

their opposition to a measure that is about to be voted on, and then offer a motion to recommit. Those precedents were stated.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the Speaker indicated it was within the rules and within the precedents. In fact, the precedents were numerous times that Republicans rose and did exactly the same thing for exactly the same reasons.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5018

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 5122, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of May 8 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 5122, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007. The Committee on Armed Services ordered the bill reported on Wednesday, May 3, and is expected to file its report with the House on Friday, May 5.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee up in room H-312 of the Capitol by 12 noon on Tuesday, May 9. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services, which will be available on the Web sites of both the Committees on Armed Services and Rules by Friday, May 5.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

□ 1445

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come. I yield to my friend, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague for yielding.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will have several measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be sent to Members'

offices by the end of the week. Any votes on those measures on Tuesday will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the House will likely consider H.R. 5122, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2007 from the Armed Services Committee. As Mr. DREIER just mentioned, the committee reported the bill yesterday, and I expect this to be considered on Wednesday and Thursday.

Now, there will be no votes next Friday, but Members should be aware that Thursday we could go well into the evening. And so while Friday is already scheduled for a day in session, I think we can complete our work on Thursday, and that will be our goal.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for that information for our Members.

Mr. Leader, do you expect any energy bills on the floor next week dealing with any facet of the crisis that confronts our citizens?

Mr. BOEHNER. We expect that H.R. 5143, the hydrogen relief bill, which was reported by the Committee on Science, could be up next week. And we can expect additional energy votes in the coming weeks.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Let me ask you further, Mr. Leader, do you expect the telecom bill to be ready for floor consideration next week?

Mr. BOEHNER. I would have hoped it would have been up this week, but there is a jurisdictional dispute that is being sorted out; and until it is, we are unable to schedule it for floor action.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

With respect to the budget, the fiscal year 2007 budget, we are now 3 weeks beyond the point when we should have had a conference report adopted under the rules. Yet we have not had the House version of the budget on the floor yet. Do you expect the budget to be on the floor anytime in the near future?

Mr. BOEHNER. I hope so.

Mr. HOYER. I know you hope so. But my question was, do you expect so?

Mr. BOEHNER. I hope so. We are continuing to work with our Members, some of whom want to spend more money, some of whom want to spend less money. And until we come to some resolution of those talks, I cannot give you any further information on when the budget resolution will be up.

Mr. HOYER. We hope that you can come to some agreement in the near term.

Mr. BOEHNER. I do too.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, the tax reconciliation conference and the pension conference, we have heard something about the tax reconciliation conference perhaps having reached agreement.

Can you tell me the status of those two conferences and when we might expect to consider the tax reconciliation